

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hartnett has designated LB 300 as his priority bill. Hearing notice from the Appropriations Committee. Revenue reports LB 277, General File with amendments; LB 682, indefinitely postponed. General Affairs reports LB 328, General File; LB 762, General File. That's all that I have, Mr. President. (See pages 978-80 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. General File, LB 668.

CLERK: LB 668, a bill introduced originally by Senator Day. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 19, was referred to the Natural Resources Committee. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments by Natural Resources pending, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Beutler, on the committee amendments.

SENATOR BEUTLER: All right, Senator Withem, members of the Legislature, the Natural Resources Committee did make one amendment that changed the bill just a little bit. Generally speaking, the committee thought that the bill was an excellent idea. It deals with the closure and post closure care and monitoring of landfills. And in the past we've had tremendous problems with people taking care of landfills once they've been closed, often times financially they simply have not put aside enough money and didn't have the wherewithal to do that. And so one of the changes that came about was that it was decided that in creating new landfills there ought to be certain rules and regulations about setting aside money, that is making financial assurances that when the proper time close...when the proper time comes to close the landfill, the money will be there to do it in accordance with the federal regulations. And the committee felt that this was a good idea, in and of itself. But it's also required by federal law. However, the problem is that federal law, like so many others, is now not coming about as quickly as possible. So the original time line that had been in the bill, April 9, 1995, obviously was going to pass before the federal regulations were known. And so Senator Day, quite rightly, is suggesting that we ought to put back the requirement for financial assurances, hopefully until the federal law came down. So the original language of the bill said that the financial assurances language should be in effect no earlier